Dear Paul,

4/22/80 85

Because there is a chance that if he gets it promptly Jim can use #14 from your 4/14 list ("FBI shows off spy it stole from the KGB") I write immediately. I also would like a copy. In addition:

89, 90, 102, 103, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 133, 138 and 140.

Re Criminal Division JFK files: don't remember if I carboned you but I asked for these more than a year ago. I just heard that they are being processed for me, so that assures the slowness Goldberg reports.

Your newly released, page 2, they should have been sent to me by the FBI, so I'd appreciate a copy of the correspondence and the records so I can complain and give the appeals office a bit of leverage.

Your confidential attachment: we do not have a "uniformed agent of the U.S. government " making deliveries but I'd like it if an uninformed one, who also uses a private car, unmarked, would deliver that to me. I'm also interested in ReBureys, if not as most are and not in any conspiratorial sense.

On 544, if pushed I imagine he'd have said that was Wall's work. If pushed real hard more might have come out, but not probably. Getting anything out of him and those like him requires more than close subject matter knowledge. But they do slip and forget. So all of it interests me.

Your 139: there were two versions, one syndicated earlier and without credit to the source, my C.A. 77-1997. The Post originally would not go for the story. After I gave it to Prugh Lardner asked me for a new lead, the story he did that you have. Sometimes works that way.

Pena interests me also. I knew he'd gotten Lane for his lawyer and knew in generally from Jerry Ray that Pena got a light sentence. Pena flipped out years ago. His original DeBrueys story was credible. The one that attracted the committees isn't. They are entirely different.

Thanks and best,